

From: [ANDERSON Jim M](#)
To: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Cc: [MCCLINCY Matt](#)
Subject: RE: FW: LWG Response to EPA Comments on Upland Source Table
Date: 08/12/2008 02:25 PM

Eric,

I replied to your questions below. Hope they help. The bottom line is I think DEQ is in position to best respond to these particular LWG comments, but you & Kristine are welcome to comment also. I think the formal reply to LWG should come from EPA, but if you'd rather, we can send it to them.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2008 2:06 PM
To: ANDERSON Jim M
Subject: Re: FW: LWG Response to EPA Comments on Upland Source Table

Jim, thanks for forwarding the LWG response to Erin. A couple of questions:

- 1) Can you tell me whether I forwarded this to the entire PH team or did you only receive it from Valerie? *I received it directly from Valerie (who sent it to you, Chip & me)...., so , no, you didn't forward it on.*
- 2) Do you need any assistance in responding to the comments? *We asked our PMs to review the LWG comments & identify those comments that we agreed with & more importantly those that we didn't agree with. I've been talking to Nick V (with LWG) & he said some of the LWG disconnect may simply be they don't have the most current information re: upland sites. Anyway, we talked about having LWG consultants talk to DEQ PMs on some of the more significant disconnects, **if necessary**. As far as your question re: assistance...., we'll be happy to draft a response to LWG & then share it with you. I think it's more appropriate for you to send the response to LWG rather than have us do it...., but I'll leave that decision to you. If you, Kristine, or anyone else wants to review & comment on the LWG submittal, please do so, but I see DEQ as being the main reviewer.* I went through the first 6 pages or so of responses and note that many of the responses seem to be consistent with information taken from the DEQ JSCS Milestone report. Is this just a matter of interpretation? *Maybe, or maybe just lack of up-to-date information from their file reviews.* In any event, I think it will be important for us to be consistent in our determinations about the likelihood of a migration pathway being complete. *I agree.* Any thoughts in general regarding the LWG response? *I don't think we'll end up with too many important disagreements between DEQ & LWG, but if we do..., I'm sticking to what our PMs say.*

Thanks, Eric